arXiv:1603.09692v2 [math.CV] 6 Apr 2016

LOCAL CRITERIA FOR NON EMBEDDABILITY OF LEVI-FLAT MANIFOLDS

TAKAYUKI KOIKE[1] AND NOBORU OGAWA[2]

Abstract. We give local criteria for smooth non-embeddablity of Levi-flat manifolds. For this purpose, we pose an analogue of Ueda theory on the neighborhood structure of hypersurfaces in complex manifolds with topologically trivial normal bundles.

1. Introduction

Our interest is a Levi-flat C^∞-*smooth* embedding problem: Which Levi-flat manifold appear in a complex manifold as a Levi-flat C^∞-*smooth* real hypersurface? In the present paper, we give a local criterion for non-embeddablity. Let M be a smooth manifold of dimension $2n+1$ and $\mathcal{F}$ a smooth foliation in M of real codimension 1 with a transversely smooth, leafwise complex structure $J_{\mathcal{F}}$. The triple $(M, \mathcal{F}, J_{\mathcal{F}})$ is called a Levi-flat manifold. In [B], Barrett showed that a Reeb foliation on S^3 can not be realized in complex surfaces as a Levi-flat smooth hypersurface. Moreover if a Levi-flat 3-manifold has a torus leaf with C^∞-flat contracting holonomy, then it admits no Levi-flat C^∞-embeddings. Barrett and Inaba [BI] gave a topological restriction of smooth Levi-flat hypersurfaces in complex surfaces. Della Sala [D] showed a higher dimensional analogue of Barrett's theorem. These results depend on the theorem of Ueda [U], which we will review in §2.2. Hence, they needed to require the compactness of a leaf. Recently, the first author posed an analogue of Ueda's theory [K]. In the present paper, we refine the argument and apply this results to Levi-flat embedding problem. The main result is the following:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $(M, \mathcal{F}, J_{\mathcal{F}})$ be a Levi-flat 5-manifold, L a leaf of $\mathcal{F}$ and C an elliptic curve as a complex submanifold of L. Assume that there exists a neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of C such that (i) the holonomy group $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{U}\cap L)$ is generated by a C^∞-flat contracting holonomy along an element of $\pi_1(C)$, (ii) there exists a C^∞-retraction $p\colon \mathcal{U} \to \mathcal{U}\cap L$ whose restriction on each leaf is locally biholomorphic and surjective, and (iii) there exists a holomorphic function f defined on $\mathcal{U}\cap L$ such that $\{f=0\} = C$. Then $(M, \mathcal{F}, J_{\mathcal{F}})$ does not admit a Levi-flat C^∞-embedding into any complex 3-manifold.*

We emphasize that, in Theorem 1.1, the compactness assumption is required only for C and thus we can apply our result to foliations without compact leaves. For example, we can deduce from Theorem 1.1 that the Levi-flat manifold $(S^3, \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Reeb}}, J_{\mathcal{F}}) \times \mathbb{C}$ (or $\mathbb{D}$) does not admit a Levi-flat C^∞-embedding into any complex 3-manifold (Example 5.1). See §5 for further examples. As combining Theorem 1.1 and [BI, Example 1], we obtain the corollary below:

Corollary 1.2. *There exist Levi-flat 5-manifolds $(M, \mathcal{F}, J_{\mathcal{F}})$ and $(N, \mathcal{G}, J_{\mathcal{G}})$ which satisfies the followings: (i) $(M, \mathcal{F}, J_{\mathcal{F}})$ does not admit a Levi-flat C^∞-embedding into any*

complex 3-manifold, (ii) $(N, \mathcal{G}, J_{\mathcal{G}})$ *admits a Levi-flat* C^∞*-embedding into* $\mathbb{C}^3$*, and (iii)* $(M, \mathcal{F})$ *and* $(N, \mathcal{G})$ *are diffeomorphic as* C^∞*-foliated manifolds.*

Theorem 1.1 can be obtained from the following:

THEOREM 1.3. *Let* $(M, \mathcal{F}, J_{\mathcal{F}})$ *be a Levi-flat* $(2n+1)$*-manifold,* L *a leaf of* $\mathcal{F}$*,* C *a compact hypersurface of* L *containing an elliptic curve* E *as a submanifold. Assume that there exists a neighborhood* $\mathcal{U}$ *of* C *such that (i) the holonomy group* $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{U} \cap L)$ *is generated by a* C^∞*-flat contracting holonomy along an element of* $\pi_1(E)$*, (ii) there exists a* C^∞*-retraction* $p\colon \mathcal{U} \to \mathcal{U} \cap L$ *whose restriction on each leaf is locally biholomorphic and surjective, and (iii) there exists a holomorphic function* f *defined on* $\mathcal{U} \cap L$ *such that* $\mathrm{div}(f) = C$*. Then* $(M, \mathcal{F}, J_{\mathcal{F}})$ *does not admit a Levi-flat* C^∞*-embedding into any complex* $(n+1)$*-manifold.*

The outline of the proof of Theorem 1.3 is based on that of [B, Theorem 1]. Assume that there exists a Levi-flat C^∞-embedding of $(M, \mathcal{F})$ into a complex manifold X. We will show the existence of a suitable holomorphic function h defined on an open neighborhood W of C in X and lead to the contradiction by applying the maximum principle to the harmonic function $\mathrm{Re}\, h$. In the proof of [B, Theorem 1], the existence of h is shown by Ueda's theory on a neighborhood structure of a complex hypersurface S in X with the $U(1)$-flat normal bundle (i.e. $N_{S/X} \in H^1(S, U(1))$). Ueda classified the pair (S, X) by using so-called *Ueda type* "type(S, X)" and gave a sufficient condition for the line bundle $\mathcal{O}_X(S)$ to be $U(1)$-flat on an open neighborhood of S ([U, Theorem 3], see also Theorem 2.2). However, in our case, one cannot apply Ueda's theorem because L need not to be compact. In order to show the existence of h, we will use a codimension-2 analogue of Ueda's theory. Let X be a complex manifold, S a complex hypersurface of X, and C a compact complex hypersurface of S such that $N_{S/X}$ is $U(1)$-flat on an open neighborhood of C in S. In [K], the first author posed the codimension-2 analogue of the notion of Ueda type ("type(C, S, X)", [K, §3.1], see also §2.2) and gave a sufficient condition for the line bundle $\mathcal{O}_X(S)$ to be $U(1)$-flat on a neighborhood of C ([K, Theorem 1]). However, recently we found some mistakes in the proof of [K, Theorem 1]. In the present paper, we pose the notion "the extension type", which also reflects a neighborhood structure of C (see Definition 3.2), and show the following theorem as a corrected version of [K, Theorem 1]:

THEOREM 1.4. *Let* X *be a complex manifold,* S *a complex non-singular hypersurface of* X*, and* C *a compact complex non-singular hypersurface of* S*. Assume that (i)* $N_{S/X}$ *is* $U(1)$*-flat and torsion on an open neighborhood* V *of* C *in* S*, (ii) there exists a holomorphic function* f *defined on* V *such that* $\mathrm{div}(f) = C$*, and (iii)* $\mathrm{type}(C, S, X) = \infty$ *and* f *is of extension type infinity. Then* $\mathcal{O}_X(S)$ *is* $U(1)$*-flat on an open neighborhood* W *of* C *in* X*. Moreover, there exists a complex hypersurface* Y *of* W *which intersects* S *transversally along* C*.*

The organization of the paper is as follows. In §2, we review Levi-flat manifolds and Ueda's theory. In §3, we give a sufficient condition for the well-definedness of the types and show Theorem 1.4. In §4, we prove Theorem 1.1 and 1.3. In §5, we give some examples and show Corollary 1.2. Throughout this paper, we assume that all manifolds and foliations are non-singular and C^∞-smooth.

2. Preliminaries

We review Levi-flat manifolds and Ueda's theory. For basics of foliation theory, we refer [CC], [HM]. For Ueda's theory, see [U], [N] and [K].

2.1. **Levi-flat manifolds.** Let M be a smooth manifold of dimension $2n+1$ with a smooth foliation $\mathcal{F}$ of real codimension 1. A foliated manifold $(M,\mathcal{F})$ is said to be equipped with a *leafwise complex structure* $J_{\mathcal{F}}$ if there exists a system of foliation charts $\{(\mathcal{U}_j,\varphi_j)\}$ which consists of an open covering $\{\mathcal{U}_j\}$ of M and homeomorphisms $\varphi_j\colon \mathcal{U}_j \to \varphi_j(\mathcal{U}_j)=\Omega\times(0,1)\subset\mathbb{C}^n\times\mathbb{R}=\{(z_j,u_j)\}$, where Ω is an open set in $\mathbb{C}^n$. The transition maps form

$$\varphi_j\circ\varphi_k^{-1}(z_k,u_k)=(f_{jk}(z_k,u_k),g_{jk}(u_k))$$

where f_{jk}'s are holomorphic in z_k and f_{jk}'s and g_{jk}'s are smooth in u_k. The triple $(M,\mathcal{F},J_{\mathcal{F}})$ is called a *Levi-flat manifold*. We say $\varphi_j^{-1}(\Omega\times\{u_j^0\})$ *a plaque* and $\varphi_j^{-1}(\{z_j^0\}\times(0,1))$ *a transversal* of $\mathcal{F}$. An equivalence class of plaques is called *a leaf* of $\mathcal{F}$, and in this situation, each leaf is a complex manifold. Hence M is foliated by complex manifolds whose complex structures vary smoothly on the transverse direction. Basic examples come from real codimension 1 invariant sets of holomorphic foliations. A real hypersurface M in a complex manifold X is said to be *Levi-flat* if M is foliated by complex hypersufaces in X. An embedding from a Levi-flat manifold $(M,\mathcal{F},J_{\mathcal{F}})$ into a complex manifold X is called a *Levi-flat embedding* if its image is a Levi-flat real hypersurface in X.

Take a closed curve γ in a leaf L with a base point p and a transversal $\mathcal{T}_p$ through p. As moving $\mathcal{T}_p$ in foliation charts around γ, the return map determines a local diffeomorphism φ on $\mathcal{T}_p$. Its germ φ_0 is called the *holonomy* of $\mathcal{F}$ along γ, which depends only on the homotopy class of γ. The holonomy φ_0 is said to be *contracting* if $|\varphi(u)|<|u|$ near 0, $u\neq 0$, where u is a coordinate on $\mathcal{T}_p$. The holonomy φ_0 is said to be C^r*-flat* $(1\le r\le\infty)$ if φ is tangent to the identity of order r at 0. Let $G=\mathrm{Diff}^\infty(\mathbb{R};0)^\delta$ be the group of germs at 0 of local C^∞ diffeomorphisms of $\mathbb{R}$ fixing 0 with the discrete topology. The above correspondence gives a homomorphism

$$\rho\colon \pi_1(L,p)\to G,$$

called the *holonomy homomorphism* of $\mathcal{F}$ along L. The image of ρ is called the holonomy group of $\mathcal{F}$ along L, denoted by $\mathcal{H}(L)$.

Example 2.1 (The Hopf construction of a Reeb component). We introduce a construction of *a Reeb component* which will be a basic example to which the main theorem apply. Set

$$\tilde{R}=(\mathbb{C}^n\times[0,\infty))\backslash\{(0',0)\}$$

with coordinates (z,u) and $0'$ is the origin in $\mathbb{C}^n$.

Choose a constant $\lambda\in\mathbb{C}$ with $|\lambda|>1$ and a diffeomorphism $\varphi\in\mathrm{Diff}^\infty([0,\infty))$ satisfies $\varphi(u)=u+f(u)$ where $f:[0,\infty)\to[0,\infty)$ with $f(0)=0$ is a strictly increasing smooth function and $f^{(k)}(0)=0$ for any $k\ge 0$. Consider the $\mathbb{Z}$-action on $\tilde{R}$ generated by

$$\gamma(z,u)=(\lambda z,\varphi(u)).$$

The quotient manifold $R=\tilde{R}/\langle\gamma\rangle^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is a Levi-flat manifold whose foliation is induced by $\{\mathbb{C}^n\times\{u\}\}_{u\in[0,\infty)}$. The underlying foliated manifold is called *a Reeb component*. The

Reeb component is diffeomorphic to $D^{2n} \times S^1$ and its boundary leaf L is a Hopf manifold. By the construction, $\mathcal{F}$ has C^∞-flat contracting holonomy along L. When $n = 1$ and $\lambda = \exp(2\pi)$, the boundary leaf L is biholomorphic to the torus $\mathbb{C}/(\mathbb{Z} + \mathbb{Z}\sqrt{-1})$. Take a copy of the Reeb component and attach along the boundary leaves by a biholomorphism induced by a map $z \mapsto \sqrt{-1}z$. Then we have a Levi-flat manifold $(S^3, \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Reeb}}, J_{\mathcal{F}})$, whose foliation is called *a Reeb foliation* on S^3.

2.2. **Review of Ueda theory.** Let us recall briefly Ueda's theory.

2.2.1. *The original Ueda theory.* Ueda's theory [U] is a neighborhood structure theory of a complex hypersurface with the topologically trivial normal bundle. Let S be a compact complex hypersurface of a complex manifold X with the $U(1)$-*flat* normal bundle: i.e. $N_{S/X} \in H^1(S, U(1))$. Then the line bundle $\mathcal{O}_X(S)$ defined by the divisor S is topologically trivial on a tubular neighborhood of S in X. For such a pair (S, X), Ueda defined an obstruction class $u_n(S, X) \in H^1(S, N_{S/X}^{-n})$ for each $n \geq 1$ (see below for the definition). By using these obstruction classes, he gave a sufficient condition for $\mathcal{O}_X(S)$ to be $U(1)$-flat around S.

Theorem 2.2 (a part of [U, Theorem 3]). *Let X be a complex manifold and S a smooth compact hypersurface of X. Assume that $N_{S/X}$ is a torsion element of the Picard group and that the pair (S, X) is of infinite type (i.e. $u_n(S, X) = 0$ for each integer $n \geq 1$). Then there exists a neighborhood V of S in X such that the line bundle $\mathcal{O}_V(S)$ is $U(1)$-flat. In particular, there exists a holomorphic function f on a neighborhood of S such that f vanishes only along S with multiplicity m, where m is the order of $N_{S/X}$.*

Remark 2.3. In [U, Theorem 3], Ueda gave a sufficient condition for the $U(1)$-flatness of the line bundle $\mathcal{O}_X(S)$ around S not only when $N_{S/X}$ is torsion, but also when $N_{S/X}$ enjoys the "Siegel type condition" ($N_{S/X} \in \mathcal{E}_1(S)$, see Remark 3.12). The $U(1)$-flatness of the line bundle $\mathcal{O}_X(S)$ around S can be interpreted as the existence of a holomorphic foliation on a neighborhood of S which has S as a leaf with a $U(1)$-linear holonomy. In this sense, Ueda theory is related to the local existence problem of the holomorphic foliations (see also [CLPT]).

Let us explain the definition of the obstruction classes $u_n(S, X)$ along §2 in [U]. Take a sufficiently fine open covering $\{V_j\}$ of S. From the assumption, $N_{S/X}$ is represented by $\{(V_{jk}, t_{jk})\}$ for some constants $t_{jk} \in U(1)$, where $V_{jk} := V_j \cap V_k$ (see [U, §1.1]). Let W be a tubular neighborhood of S in X and $\{W_j\}$ be sufficiently fine open covering of W. Assume that $V_j = W_j \cap S$ for each j, and $V_{jk} = \emptyset$ iff $W_{jk} = \emptyset$. Take a coordinates system (z_j, w_j) on W_j such that z_j is a coordinate on V_j, w_j is a defining function of V_j and $(w_j/w_k)|_{V_{jk}} \equiv t_{jk}$ on V_{jk} for each j, k. Let n be a positive integer. We say that a system $\{(W_j, w_j)\}$ is *of type n* if $\mathrm{mult}_{V_{jk}}(t_{jk}w_k - w_j) \geq n + 1$ holds (i.e. the n-jet of $t_{jk}w_k - w_j$ vanishes along V_{jk}) on each W_{jk}. If there exists a system $\{(W_j, w_j)\}$ of type n, the Taylor expansion of $t_{jk}w_k$ in the variable w_j on W_{jk} around $\{w_j = 0\}$ can be written in the form

$$t_{jk}w_k = w_j + f_{jk}^{(n+1)}(z_j) \cdot w_j^{n+1} + O(w_j^{n+2})$$

for some holomorphic function $f_{jk}^{(n+1)}$ defined on V_{jk}. It is known that $\{(V_{jk}, f_{jk}^{(n+1)})\}$ satisfies the cocycle condition (see [U, p. 588]).

Definition 2.4. Suppose that there exists a system of type n. Then the cohomology class

$$u_n(S,X) := [\{(V_{jk}, f_{jk}^{(n+1)})\}] \in H^1(S, N_{S/X}^{-n})$$

is called *the n-th Ueda class* of the pair (S,X).

Remark 2.5. Unfortunately, the n-th Ueda class *does* depend on the choice of a system of type n. Thus, strictly speaking, this class should be written as "$u_n(S,X;\{w_j\})$" in the general setting. However, under some configurations, the condition "$u_n(S,X)=0$" does not depend on the choice of a system of type n. For example, it follows from Ueda's argument in [U, p. 588] that the n-th Ueda class is well-defined up to non-zero constant multiples if S is compact, or if $N_{S/X}$ is holomorphically trivial and $H^0(S,\mathcal{O}_S)=\mathbb{C}$ holds. We will also show the well-definedness of the condition "$u_n(S,X)=0$" for a slightly generalized configuration which appears in the proof of our main results (under "the jet extension property", see §3.2).

At first, we consider the case where the condition "$u_n(S,X)=0$" does not depend on the choice of a system of type n. In this case, it is known that $u_n(S,X)=0$ if and only if there exists a system of type $n+1$. Thus, in this case, one of the following occurs.

- There exists an integer $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that $u_m(S,X)$ can be defined only when $m \leq n$, $u_m(S,X)=0$ for $m<n$, and $u_n(S,X)\neq 0$.
- For every integer $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, $u_n(S,X)$ can be defined and $u_n(S,X)=0$.

We denote by "type (S,X)" the supremum of the set of integers n such that $u_m(S,X)$ can be defined and $u_m(S,X)=0$ for each $m<n$. In this paper, we will treat the notion "of infinite type" in a slightly general setting (even if the condition "$u_n(S,X)=0$" depends on the choice of a system of type n) by adopting the following definition:

Definition 2.6. We say that the pair (S,X) is *of infinite type* if $u_n(S,X;\{w_j\})=0$ holds for each $n\geq 1$ and for *any* system $\{(W_j,w_j)\}$ of type n.

2.2.2. *The codimension-2 Ueda theory.* In [K], a codimension-2 analogue of this Ueda's theorem is posed. Let X be a complex manifold, S a complex hypersurface of X, and C a compact complex hypersurface of S with the normal bundles $(N_{S/X},\{t_{jk}\})$ and $(N_{C/S},\{s_{jk}\})$. Assume that $N_{S/X}$ is $U(1)$-flat on an open neighborhood V of C in S and $N_{C/S}$ is also $U(1)$-flat: $t_{jk}, s_{jk} \in U(1)$. Let W be a tubular neighborhood of C in X such that $W\cap S = V$. Take a sufficiently fine open covering $\{U_j\}$ of C, $\{V_j\}$ of V, and $\{W_j\}$ of W such that $V_j = W_j \cap S$, $U_j = V_j \cap C$, and $V_{jk}=\emptyset$ iff $W_{jk}=\emptyset$. Extend a coordinates system x_j of U_j to W_j. Let y_j be a defining function of U_j in V_j and w_j a defining function of V_j in W_j. Denote an extension of y_j on W_j by z_j so that (x_j,z_j,w_j) is a coordinates system on W_j. From the same argument as in [U, §2], we may assume that $(w_j/w_k)|_{V_{jk}} \equiv t_{jk}$ and $(z_j/z_k)|_{U_{jk}} \equiv s_{jk}$.

Assume that our system $\{(W_j,w_j)\}$ is of type (n,m) in the sense of [K, Definition 4]. i.e. the coefficient of $w_j^\nu z_j^\mu$ in the Taylor expansion of the function $t_{jk}w_k - w_j$ in the variables w_j and z_j around U_{jk} is equal to zero if $(\nu,\mu)<(n,m)$ holds in the lexicographical order, namely $(a,b)\leq(a',b') \overset{\text{def}}{\Leftrightarrow} a<a'$ or "$a=a'$ and $b\leq b'$". Then the function $t_{jk}w_k$ can be

expanded in the variable w_j as

$$t_{jk}w_k = w_j + f_{jk}^{(n+1)}(x_j, z_j)\cdot w_j^{n+1} + O(w_j^{n+2}) \tag{1}$$

and the expansion of $f_{jk}^{(n+1)}(x_j, z_j)$ in the variable z_j is written by

$$f_{jk}^{(n+1)}(x_j, z_j) = g_{jk}^{(n+1,m)}(x_j)\cdot z_j^m + O(z_j^{m+1}). \tag{2}$$

It can be shown that a system $\{(U_{jk}, g_{jk}^{(n+1,m)})\}$ enjoys the cocycle condition for the line bundle $N_{S/X}|_C^{-n} \otimes N_{C/X}^{-m}$ ([K, Proposition 2]). The 1-cocycle $\{(U_{jk}, g_{jk}^{(n+1,m)})\}$ defines an element of $H^1(C, N_{S/X}|_C^{-n} \otimes N_{C/S}^{-m})$, denoted by $u_{n,m}(C, S, X)$ and called *the* (n, m)*-th Ueda class* of the triple (C, S, X).

Remark 2.7. The (n, m)-th Ueda class also *does* depend on the choice of a system of type (n, m) (Let us take this opportunity to report that we found a mistake in the proof of [K, Proposition 3]). Strictly speaking, this class should be written as "$u_{n,m}(C, S, X; \{w_j\})$" in general settings. However, under some configurations, the condition "$u_{n,m}(C, S, X) = 0$" *does not* depend on the choice of a system of type (n, m) as in the case of u_n. We will show the well-definedness of the condition "$u_{n,m}(C, S, X) = 0$" under "the jet extension property" (see §3.2).

Definition 2.8. We say that the triple (C, S, X) is *of infinite type* if $u_{n,m}(C, S, X; \{w_j\}) = 0$ holds for each $n \geq 1, m \geq 0$ and for *any* system $\{(W_j, w_j)\}$ of type (n, m).

Remark 2.9. If the pair (S, X) is of infinite type and the condition "$u_{n,m}(C, S, X; \{w_j\}) = 0$" does not depend on the choice of the system $\{w_j\}$ of type (n, m), then the triple (C, S, X) is of infinite type.

2.3. **Barrett-Fornaess' theorem and Appendix in** [B]**.** Let $(M, \mathcal{F})$ be a Levi-flat hypersuface in a complex manifold X. In [BF], Barrett and Fornaess showed that if M is of class C^r $(r \geq 2)$ then so is $\mathcal{F}$. To show this, they constructed local holomorphic coordinates approximating a foliation chart of $(M, \mathcal{F})$. In the appendix of [B], by using this, Barrett clarified a relation between the Ueda type of a leaf and the C^r-flatness of holonomy. This point of view appears in §3.3 and §4.

More precisely, from the condition of C^r-flatness, we obtain the following data (Appendix in [B]): A system $\{(W_j, w_j)\}$ of holomorphic local defining functions for L in X and a system $\{(\mathcal{U}_j, u_j)\}$ of leafwise constant C^∞ defining functions for L in M which satisfy $\mathcal{U}_j = W_j \cap M$ and the following conditions for each j, k :

(i) $w_k - w_j = O(w_j^{r+1})$ on W_{jk},
(ii) $u_k - u_j = O(u_j^{r+1})$ on $\mathcal{U}_{jk}$,
(iii) $(\mathrm{Im}\ w_j)|_{\mathcal{U}_j} = o(|w_j|^r)$ on $\mathcal{U}_j$ and
(iv) $(\mathrm{Re}\ w_j)|_{\mathcal{U}_j} = u_j + o(u_j^r)$ on $\mathcal{U}_j$.

The condition (ii) is the C^r-flatness of $\mathcal{F}$. The condition (iii) was shown in [BF]. To get such a system, for a holomorphic local defining function of L, we inductively correct it so as to vanish the jet of its imaginary part along M. In the arguments in §3.2 and §3.3, we will follow a similar procedure.

PROPOSITION 2.10 (Barrett, Appendix in [B]). *Let $(M, \mathcal{F})$ be a Levi-flat hypersurface in a complex manifold X and L a (possibly non-compact) leaf of $\mathcal{F}$ embedded in X. If $\mathcal{F}$ has C^r-flat holonomy along L, then there exists a system $\{(W_j, w_j)\}$ of defining holomorphic functions for each plaque of L which satisfy the following conditions:*

$$w_k - w_j = O(w_j^{r+1}) \text{ on } W_{jk} \quad \text{and} \quad (\mathrm{Im}\ w_j)|_{\mathcal{U}_j} = o(|w_j|^r) \text{ on } \mathcal{U}_j.$$

In particular, the normal bundle $N_{L/X}$ is holomorphically trivial. If L is compact, then the pair (L, X) is of infinite type in the sense of Ueda.

3. Codimension 2 Ueda theory and jet extension property

Let the triple (C, S, X) and its normal bundles be as in §2.2.2. Take tubular neighborhoods V and W, open coverings $\{U_j\}, \{V_j\}$ and $\{W_j\}$, and functions $\{x_j\}, \{y_j\}, \{z_j\}$ and $\{w_j\}$ as in §2.2.2. In addition, assume that $\{y_j\}$ satisfies $s_{jk}y_k = y_j$ on V_{jk}. In the following sections, we will refine the system $\{w_j\}$ and the extension $\{z_j\}$ of $\{y_j\}$ *with fixing* $\{x_j\}$ *and* $\{y_j\}$.

3.1. **The extension type.**

We introduce the notion of the *type* of extension $\{z_j\}$ of $\{y_j\}$.

DEFINITION 3.1. Let $\{y_j\}$ and $\{z_j\}$ be as above. For $n \geq 1, m \geq 0$, the extension $\{z_j\}$ of $\{y_j\}$ is *of type* (n, m) if the expansion in w_j forms

$$s_{jk}z_k = z_j + p_{jk}^{(n)}(x_j, z_j) \cdot w_j^n + O(w_j^{n+1})$$

and the expansion of $p_{jk}^{(n)}(x_j, z_j)$ in z_j is written by

$$p_{jk}^{(n)}(x_j, z_j) = q_{jk}^{(n,m)}(x_j) \cdot z_j^m + O(z_j^m)$$

for each j.

The 1-cochain $\{(U_{jk}, q_{jk}^{(n,m)})\}$ satisfies the cocycle condition valued on $N_{S/X}|_C^{-n} \otimes N_{C/S}^{-m+1}$. This 1-cocycle defines a cohomology class in $H^1(C, N_{S/X}|_C^{-n} \otimes N_{C/S}^{-m+1})$, which is denoted by $v_{n,m}(C, S, X; \{z_j\})$.

DEFINITION 3.2. We say that $\{y_j\}$ is *of extension type infinity* if $v_{n,m}(C, S, X; \{z_j\}) = 0$ holds for each $n \geq 1, m \geq 0$ and for *any* type (n, m) extension $\{z_j\}$ of $\{y_j\}$.

3.2. **Well-definedness of the types and jet extension property.**

As we mentioned, the cohomology classes u_n, $u_{n,m}$ and also $v_{n,m}$ depend on the choice of systems. Let us give sufficient conditions for the well-definedness of "$u_n = 0$", "$u_{n,m} = 0$" and "$v_{n,m} = 0$".

DEFINITION 3.3. We say the pair (V, W) satisfies *the n-jet extension property* $(n \geq 1)$ if the restriction map $H^0(W, \mathcal{O}_W/I_V^{n+1}) \to H^0(W, \mathcal{O}_W/I_V) = H^0(V, \mathcal{O}_V)$ is surjective, where $I_V \subset \mathcal{O}_W$ is the defining ideal sheaf of V. Also say that the pair (V, W) satisfies *the jet extension property* if it does the n-th jet extension property for any n.

3.2.1. *Well-definedness of the condition* "$u_n = 0$". Ueda showed the well-definedness of Ueda type when V is compact ([U, p. 588]). The key point of the proof is that the restriction map $H^0(W, \mathcal{O}_W) \to H^0(V, \mathcal{O}_V) = \mathbb{C}$ is surjective. In this subsection, we refine this argument (see also the proof of [N, Lemma 1.2]).

LEMMA 3.4. *The condition $u_n(V, W; \{w_j\}) = 0$ does not depend on the choice of the system $\{w_j\}$ of type n if the pair (V, W) satisfies the n-jet extension property.*

Proof. Let $\{(W_j, w_j)\}$ and $\{(W_j, \widehat{w}_j)\}$ be systems of type n. Set $V_j = W_j \cap V$ for each j. Consider the expansion

$$\widehat{w}_j = a_j^{(1)} \cdot w_j + a_j^{(2)} \cdot w_j^2 + \cdots + a_j^{(n)} \cdot w_j^n + \cdots$$

by w_j. Then it is easy to check that $\{a_j^{(1)}\}$ defines a global function $a^{(1)} \in H^0(V, \mathcal{O}_V^*)$. By the n-jet extension property, we can take nowhere vanishing holomorphic functions $\widetilde{a}_j^{(1)} \colon W_j \to \mathbb{C}$ with $\widetilde{a}_j^{(1)}|_{V_j} = a_j^{(1)}$ and $\widetilde{a}_k^{(1)} - \widetilde{a}_j^{(1)} = O(w_j^{n+1})$ on W_{jk} for each j, k (by shrinking W_j if necessary).

Set $\widehat{w}'_j := \widehat{w}_j / \widetilde{a}_j^{(1)}$ and consider the new system $\{(W_j, \widehat{w}'_j)\}$. Since

$$\widehat{w}'_k - \widehat{w}'_j = \frac{1}{\widetilde{a}_j^{(1)}} \cdot \left(\frac{\widetilde{a}_j^{(1)}}{\widetilde{a}_k^{(1)}} \cdot \widehat{w}_k - \widehat{w}_j \right) = \frac{1}{\widetilde{a}_j^{(1)}} \cdot \big(\widehat{w}_k - \widehat{w}_j + O(\widehat{w}_j^{n+2}) \big) = \frac{1}{\widetilde{a}_j^{(1)}} \cdot \widehat{f}_{jk}^{(n+1)} \cdot \widehat{w}_j^{n+1} + O(\widehat{w}_j^{n+2}),$$

we can conclude that $u_n(V, W; \{\widehat{w}'_j\}) = (a^{(1)})^n \cdot u_n(V, W; \{\widehat{w}_j\})$ holds. Here $\widehat{f}_{jk}^{(n+1)}$ is as in the expansion (1) in §2.2. Thus we may replace $\{\widehat{w}_j\}$ by $\{\widehat{w}'_j\}$ for our purpose, so that may assume that the expansion is given by

$$\widehat{w}_j = w_j + a_j^{(2)} \cdot w_j^2 + \cdots + a_j^{(n)} \cdot w_j^n + \cdots .$$

In what follows, we will show the equality $u_n(V, W; \{w_j\}) = u_n(V, W; \{\widehat{w}_j\})$ for *any* system $\{(W_j, \widehat{w}_j)\}$ of type n with

$$\widehat{w}_j = w_j + a_j^{(\nu)} \cdot w_j^\nu + a_j^{(\nu+1)} \cdot w_j^{\nu+1} + \cdots$$

for each j. Here $\nu \geq 2$ is the infimum of the lowest degrees of $\{\widehat{w}_j - w_j\}$. The proof is by induction on ν. When $\nu > n+1$, the equality clearly holds. It also holds when $\nu = n+1$. In fact, since

$$\widehat{w}_k - \widehat{w}_j = (f_{jk}^{(n+1)} + a_k^{(n+1)} - a_j^{(n+1)}) \cdot \widehat{w}_j^{n+1} + O(\widehat{w}_j^{n+2}),$$

we have $u_n(V, W; \{w_j\}) = u_n(V, W; \{\widehat{w}_j\})$. Assume that the equality holds for any system of type n with such an expansion for $\nu > \nu_0$. Consider a system $\{(W_j, \widehat{w}_j)\}$ of type n with

$$\widehat{w}_j = w_j + a_j^{(\nu_0)} \cdot w_j^{\nu_0} + a_j^{(\nu_0+1)} \cdot w_j^{\nu_0+1} + \cdots .$$

It is easy to check that $\{a_j^{(\nu_0)}\}$ defines a global function $a^{(\nu_0)} \in H^0(V, \mathcal{O}_V)$. Thus, by the assumption, we can take holomorphic functions $\widetilde{a}_j^{(\nu_0)} \colon W_j \to \mathbb{C}$ with $\widetilde{a}_j^{(\nu_0)}|_{V_j} = a_j^{(\nu_0)}$ and $\widetilde{a}_j^{(\nu_0)} - \widetilde{a}_k^{(\nu_0)} = O(w_j^{\nu_0+1})$ on W_{jk} for each j, k. Then we set

$$\widehat{w}'_j := \widehat{w}_j - \widetilde{a}_j^{(\nu_0)} \cdot w_j^{\nu_0}$$

and consider the new system $\{(W_j, \widehat{w}'_j)\}$. The simple computation shows that

$$u_n(V, W; \{\widehat{w}_j\}) = u_n(V, W; \{\widehat{w}'_j\}) \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{w}'_j = w_j + O(w_j^{\nu_0+1}).$$

By the assumption of induction, we obtain $u_n(V, W, \{w_j\}) = u_n(V, W, \{\widehat{w}_j\})$. The proof is completed. □

3.2.2. *Well-definedness of the conditions* "$u_{n,m} = 0$" *and* "$v_{n,m} = 0$". The conditions "$u_{n,m} = 0$" does not depend on the choice of the type $(1, 0)$ extension $\{z_j\}$ of $\{y_j\}$. In this subsection, we show the well-definedness of the condition "$u_{n,m} = 0$" for the choice of $\{w_j\}$, and of the condition "$v_{n,m} = 0$" for the choice of $\{w_j\}$ and $\{z_j\}$. The proof is in essentially the same manner as Lemma 3.4.

LEMMA 3.5. *The condition $u_{n,m}(C, V, W; \{w_j\}) = 0$ does not depend on the choice of the system $\{w_j\}$ of type (n, m) if $t_{jk} \equiv 1$ and the pair (V, W) satisfies the n-jet extension property.*

Proof. Let $\{(W_j, w_j)\}$ and $\{(W_j, \widehat{w}_j)\}$ be systems of type (n, m). Denote the expansion coefficients by $f_{jk}^{(n+1)}(x_j, z_j)$, $\widehat{f}_{jk}^{(n+1)}(x_j, z_j)$, $g_{jk}^{(n+1,m)}(x_j)$ and $\widehat{g}_{jk}^{(n+1,m)}(x_j)$ as in the expansions (1) and (2) in §2.2. In the same manner as in the proof of Lemma 3.4, form the n-jet extension property, we may assume that

$$\widehat{w}_j = w_j + a_j^{(n+1)}(x_j, z_j) \cdot w_j^{n+1} + O(w_j^{n+2})$$

while keeping desired property for the Ueda type. For such w_j, we have

$$\widehat{f}_{jk}^{(n+1)}(x_j, z_j) = f_{jk}^{(n+1)}(x_j, z_j) + a_k^{(n+1)}(x_k, z_k) - a_j^{(n+1)}(x_j, z_j).$$

Next, consider the expansion

$$a_j^{(n+1)}(x_j, y_j) = a_j^{(n+1,\mu)}(x_j) \cdot y_j^{\mu} + O(y_j^{\mu+1})$$

on V_j, where $\mu \geq 2$ is the infimum of the lowest degrees of $\{a_j^{(n+1)}\}$. As repeating the same argument for $\{a_j^{(n+1,\mu)}\}$, $\{g_{jk}^{(n+1,m)}\}$, and $\{\widehat{g}_{jk}^{(n+1,m)}\}$ on (C, V), we can show the assertion. In fact, when $\mu \geq m$, $\{g_{jk}^{(n+1,m)}\}$ and $\{\widehat{g}_{jk}^{(n+1,m)}\}$ represent the same class, so that the proof finishes. When $\mu < m$, $\{a_j^{(n+1,\mu)}\}$ defines the non-trivial class $a^{(n+1,\mu)} \in H^0(C, N_{C/S}^{-\mu})$. Since T is compact, $N_{C/S}^{-\mu}$ is trivial and $a^{(n+1,\mu)}$ is a non zero constant. Then we set

$$\widehat{w}'_j := \widehat{w}_j - a^{(n+1,\mu)} \cdot z_j^{\mu} w_j^{n+1} = w_j + O(z_j^{\mu+1}) w_j^{n+1} + O(w_j^{n+2}).$$

and consider the new system $\{(W_j, \widehat{w}'_j)\}$. By the direct calculation of $\widehat{w}'_k - \widehat{w}'_j$, we obtain $u_{n,m}(C, V, W; \{\widehat{w}_j\}) = u_{n,m}(C, V, W; \{\widehat{w}'_j\})$. As repeating this procedure inductively, it reduces the case $m = \mu$, so that the proof is completed. □

LEMMA 3.6. *The condition $v_{n,m}(C, V, W; \{z_j\}) = 0$ does not depend on the choice of the system $\{w_j\}$ of type $(1, 0)$.*

Proof. Let $\{z_j\}$ be an (n, m) type extension of $\{y_j\}$, $\{(W_j, w_j)\}$ and $\{(W_j, \widehat{w}_j)\}$ be systems of type $(1, 0)$. The expansion of z_j in $\widehat{w}_j$ is denoted by

$$s_{jk} z_k = z_j + \widehat{p}_{jk}^{(n)}(x_j, z_j) \widehat{w}_j^n + O(\widehat{w}_j^{n+1}).$$

The expansion of $\widehat{w}_j$ in w_j is written by

$$\widehat{w}_j = a_j^{(1)}(x_j, z_j)w_j + O(w_j^2)$$

and $\{a_j^{(1)}\}$ defines a global function $a^{(1)}\colon V \to \mathbb{C}^*$ as in the proof of Lemma 3.4. Moreover, the top terms $\{a_j^{(1,0)}(x_j)\}$ of the expansion of $a_j^{(1)}(x_j, y_j)$ in y_j on V_j defines a global (constant) function $a^{(1,0)}\colon C \to \mathbb{C}^*$. Then we have

$$\widehat{p}_{jk}^{(n)}(x_j, z_j) = (a^{(1)})^{-n} \cdot p_{jk}^{(n)}(x_j, z_j) = (a^{(1,0)})^{-n} \cdot q_{jk}^{(n,m)}(x_j) \cdot y_j^m + O(y_j^{m+1}),$$

so that we conclude that $\widehat{q}_{jk}^{(n,m)}(x_j) = (a^{(1,0)})^{-n} \cdot q_{jk}^{(n,m)}(x_j)$. □

LEMMA 3.7. *Assume that $t_{jk} \equiv 1$, $s_{jk} \equiv 1$ and the pair (V, W) satisfies the n-jet extension property. Also assume that there exists a system $\{w_j\}$ of type $(n, 0)$. Then, for each $m \geq 0$, $v_{n,m}(C, V, W; \{z_j\}) = 0$ for any extension $\{z_j\}$ of type (n, m).*

Proof. Take a system $\{w_j\}$ of type $(n, 0)$. By the assumption $s_{jk} \equiv 1$, $\{y_j\}$ defines a global function on V. From the n-jet extension property, there exists an extension $\{z_j\}$ of $\{y_j\}$ with

$$z_k = z_j + O(w_j^{n+1}), \tag{3}$$

so that $v_{n,m}(C, V, W; \{z_j\}) = 0$ holds.

Let $\{\widehat{z}_j\}$ be another extension of $\{y_j\}$ with type (n, m). The expansion coefficients are denoted by $p_{jk}^{(n+1)}(x_j, z_j)$, $\widehat{p}_{jk}^{(n+1)}(x_j, \widehat{z}_j)$, $q_{jk}^{(n+1,m)}(x_j)$ and $\widehat{q}_{jk}^{(n+1,m)}(x_j)$. Since $\widehat{z}_j|_{V_j} = z_j|_{V_j} = y_j$, the expansion of $\widehat{z}_j$ in w_j is written by

$$\widehat{z}_j = z_j + a_j^{(1)}(x_j, z_j) \cdot w_j + O(w_j^2).$$

From the n-jet extension property and $w_k - w_j = O(w_j^{n+1})$, we may assume that

$$\widehat{z}_j = z_j + a_j^{(n)}(x_j, z_j) \cdot w_j^n + O(w_j^{n+1}).$$

while keeping desired property. Then, by (3), we have

$$\widehat{z}_k - \widehat{z}_j = (a_k^{(n)}(x_k, z_k) - a_j^{(n)}(x_j, z_j)) \cdot w_j^n + O(w_j^{n+1}).$$

As repeating same procedure for the expansion of $a_k^{(n)}(x_k, z_k) - a_j^{(n)}(x_j, z_j)$, it follows that $[\widehat{q}_{jk}^{(n+1,m)}(x_j)] = [q_{jk}^{(n,m)}(x_j)] = 0$. □

3.3. **Proof of jet extension property.** Let us go back to the situation that L is a leaf of a Levi-flat hypersurface $(M, \mathcal{F})$ in X. After shrinking X so as a connected component of L is embedded in X, we use the notations V, $\mathcal{U}$ and W instead of L, M and X.

PROPOSITION 3.8. *Let W be a complex manifold and V a hypersurface of W. Assume that (i) there exists a Levi-flat C^∞ hypersurface $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{F}) \subset W$ including V as a leaf along which $\mathcal{F}$ has C^2-flat holonomy and (ii) there exists a C^∞ retraction $p\colon \mathcal{U} \to V$ which is leafwise holomorphic. Then, the pair (V, W) satisfies the jet extension property.*

Proof. Since the holonomy along V is C^2-flat, we obtain the data $\{(W_j, w_j)\}$ and $\{(\mathcal{U}_j, u_j)\}$ which satisfy the condition (ii),(iii) and (iv) described in §2.3. Take a holomorphic function $f \in H^0(V, \mathcal{O}_V)$ and denote the restriction $f|_{V_j}$ by f_j . From Lemma 3.9 below, for $n \geq 1$ and each j, we can take a holomorphic function $\widetilde{f}_j^{(n)} \colon W_j \to \mathbb{C}$ such that $\widetilde{f}_j^{(n)}|_{V_j} = f_j$ and $\widetilde{f}_j^{(n)}|_{\mathcal{U}_j} - (p^*f)|_{\mathcal{U}_j} = O(u_j^n)$. Let

$$\widetilde{f}_k^{(n)} - \widetilde{f}_j^{(n)} = \widetilde{a}_{jk}^{(\nu)} \cdot w_j^\nu + \widetilde{a}_{jk}^{(\nu+1)} \cdot w_j^{\nu+1} + \cdots$$

be the expansion on W_{jk}, where $\widetilde{a}_{jk}^{(\nu)}$ is the pull back of a holomorphic function $a_{jk}^{(\nu)}$ on V_j by the coordinate projection $W_j \to V_j$. On $\mathcal{U}_{jk}$, we obtain the expansion in u_j:

$$\begin{aligned}(\widetilde{f}_k^{(n)} - \widetilde{f}_j^{(n)})|_{\mathcal{U}_{jk}} &= \widetilde{a}_{jk}^{(\nu)}|_{\mathcal{U}_{jk}} \cdot w_j|_{\mathcal{U}_{jk}}^\nu + O(u_j^{\nu+1}) \\ &= (\pi_j^* a_{jk}^{(\nu)} + O(u_j)) \cdot (u_j + O(u_j^2))^\nu + O(u_j^{\nu+1}) \\ &= \pi_j^* a_{jk}^{(\nu)} \cdot u_j^\nu + O(u_j^{\nu+1}),\end{aligned}$$

where $\pi_j \colon \mathcal{U}_j \to V_j$ is the coordinate projection. On the other hand, we have

$$(\widetilde{f}_k^{(n)} - \widetilde{f}_j^{(n)})|_{\mathcal{U}_{jk}} = (\widetilde{f}_k^{(n)} - p^*f)|_{\mathcal{U}_{jk}} - (\widetilde{f}_j^{(n)} - p^*f)|_{\mathcal{U}_{jk}} = O(u_j^n).$$

Comparing these expansions, we obtain $\nu \geq n$, so that the proposition follows. □

LEMMA 3.9. *Let $\{W_j\}, \{w_j\}, \{u_j\}$ and $\{f_j\}$ be as above. Then, for $n \geq 1$ and each j, there exist holomorphic functions $\widetilde{f}_j^{(n)} \colon W_j \to \mathbb{C}$ such that*

$$\widetilde{f}_j^{(n)}|_{V_j} = f_j \quad \textit{and} \quad \widetilde{f}_j^{(n)}|_{\mathcal{U}_j} - (p^*f)|_{\mathcal{U}_j} = O(u_j^n).$$

Proof. The proof is by induction on n. We may assume that W_j is Stein by shrinking if necessary. The statement is clear when $n = 1$. Assume that the lemma is true for n. Let

$$\widetilde{f}_j^{(n)}|_{\mathcal{U}_j} - (p^*f)|_{\mathcal{U}_j} = \theta_j^{(n)} \cdot u_j^n + O(u_j^{n+1})$$

be the expansion in u_j. Since $\widetilde{f}_j^{(n)}|_{\mathcal{U}_j}$ and $(p^*f)|_{\mathcal{U}_j}$ are leafwise holomorphic, we can easily show that $\theta_j^{(n)}$ is holomorphic on V_j. As taking holomorphic functions $\widetilde{\theta}_j^{(n)} \colon W_j \to \mathbb{C}$ such that $\widetilde{\theta}_j^{(n)}|_{V_j} = \theta_j^{(n)}$, we define holomorphic functions $\widetilde{f}_j^{(n+1)} \colon W_j \to \mathbb{C}$ by

$$\widetilde{f}_j^{(n+1)} := \widetilde{f}_j^{(n)} - \widetilde{\theta}_j^{(n)} \cdot w_j^n.$$

Then the simple computation shows that $\widetilde{f}_j^{(n+1)}|_{\mathcal{U}_j} - (p^*f)|_{\mathcal{U}_j} = O(u_j^{n+1})$ holds. □

3.4. **Proof of Theorem 1.4.** Let us prove Theorem 1.4 not only for the case $\mathrm{div}(f) = C$, but also the case $\{f = 0\} = C$. Set $\lambda := \mathrm{mult}_C f$ and $y_j := (f^{1/\lambda})|_{V_j}$. We prove this theorem under the assumption "$\{y_j\}$ is of extension type infinity" instead of "f is of extension type infinity". Take an extension $\{z_j\}$ of $\{y_j\}$ of type $(2, 0)$ (see Remark 3.11 (a)) and a system $\{w_j\}$ of type $(1, 0)$. Let

$$\begin{pmatrix} t_{jk} w_k \\ s_{jk} z_k \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} w_j \\ z_j \end{pmatrix} + \sum_{\nu=2}^{\infty} \sum_{\mu=0}^{\infty} \begin{pmatrix} g_{jk}^{(\nu,\mu)}(x_j) \\ q_{jk}^{(\nu,\mu)}(x_j) \end{pmatrix} \cdot w_j^\nu z_j^\mu \tag{4}$$

be the expansions on W_{jk}. We will refine the system $\{w_j\}$ and the extension $\{z_j\}$ of $\{y_j\}$ on W_j *with fixing* $\{x_j\}$ *and* $\{y_j\}$.

The goal of this proof is to construct a new system $\{v_j\}$ and a new extension $\{\zeta_j\}$ of $\{y_j\}$ satisfying

$$\begin{pmatrix} t_{jk}v_k \\ s_{jk}\zeta_k \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} v_j \\ \zeta_j \end{pmatrix} \tag{5}$$

on each W_{jk} after shrinking W if necessary. Then $\{v_j\}$ gives a $U(1)$-flat structure on $\mathcal{O}_X(S)$ and $\{\zeta_j\}$ defines a complex hypersurface Y of W which intersects S transversally along C. Let us construct such defining functions $\{v_j\}$ and $\{\zeta_j\}$ by solving a Schröder type functional equation defined by (4) and (5) as in [U, §4.2] and [K, §4.1]. However, in our situation, some difficulties arise from non-compactness of V and Y. In order to avoid the difficulties, we solve two functional equations together, whose solutions have a compact common zero $C = V \cap Y$.

Let us consider the Schröder type functional equation

$$\begin{pmatrix} w_j \\ z_j \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} v_j \\ \zeta_j \end{pmatrix} + \sum_{\nu=2}^{\infty}\sum_{\mu=0}^{\infty} \begin{pmatrix} G_j^{(\nu,\mu)}(x_j) \\ Q_j^{(\nu,\mu)}(x_j) \end{pmatrix} \cdot v_j^{\nu}\zeta_j^{\mu} \tag{6}$$

on each W_j, where the coefficient functions $G_j^{(\nu,\mu)}$ and $Q_j^{(\nu,\mu)}$ are holomorphic functions depending only on x_j. We will construct the coefficients $\{(G_j^{(\nu,\mu)}, Q_j^{(\nu,\mu)})\}$ so that the solutions $\{(v_j, \zeta_j)\}$ exist and satisfy the equation (5).

In order to explain how to construct the coefficients, let us first observe the properties of them by assuming that $\{v_j\}$ and $\{\zeta_j\}$ are solutions of the equation (5) on each W_{jk}. Consider the following two manners of the expansion of $(t_{jk}w_k, s_{jk}z_k)|_{W_{jk}}$ in v_j and ζ_j. The first one is obtained as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (7)\begin{pmatrix} t_{jk}w_k \\ s_{jk}z_k \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} t_{jk}v_k \\ s_{jk}\zeta_k \end{pmatrix} + \sum_{(\nu,\mu)\geq(2,0)} \begin{pmatrix} t_{jk}G_k^{(\nu,\mu)}(x_k) \\ s_{jk}Q_k^{(\nu,\mu)}(x_k) \end{pmatrix} \cdot v_k^{\nu}\zeta_k^{\mu} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} v_j \\ \zeta_j \end{pmatrix} + \sum_{(\nu,\mu)\geq(2,0)} \begin{pmatrix} t_{jk}^{-\nu+1}s_{jk}^{-\mu}G_k^{(\nu,\mu)}(x_k) \\ t_{jk}^{-\nu}s_{jk}^{-\mu+1}Q_k^{(\nu,\mu)}(x_k) \end{pmatrix} \cdot v_j^{\nu}\zeta_j^{\mu} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} v_j \\ \zeta_j \end{pmatrix} + \sum_{(\nu,\mu)\geq(2,0)} \begin{pmatrix} t_{jk}^{-\nu+1}s_{jk}^{-\mu}G_k^{(\nu,\mu)}(x_k(x_j)) + h_{1,jk,\nu\mu}^{(1)}(x_j) \\ t_{jk}^{-\nu}s_{jk}^{-\mu+1}Q_k^{(\nu,\mu)}(x_k(x_j)) + h_{1,jk,\nu\mu}^{(2)}(x_j) \end{pmatrix} \cdot v_j^{\nu}\zeta_j^{\mu}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we denoted by

$$\begin{pmatrix} G_k^{(\nu,\mu)}(x_k(x_j, z_j, w_j)) \\ Q_k^{(\nu,\mu)}(x_k(x_j, z_j, w_j)) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} G_k^{(\nu,\mu)}(x_k(x_j)) \\ Q_k^{(\nu,\mu)}(x_k(x_j)) \end{pmatrix} + \sum_{(p,q)\geq(0,1)} \begin{pmatrix} G_{kj,pq}^{(\nu,\mu)}(x_j) \\ Q_{kj,pq}^{(\nu,\mu)}(x_j) \end{pmatrix} \cdot w_j^p z_j^q$$

the expansions of $(G_k^{(\nu,\mu)}, Q_k^{(\nu,\mu)})$ in z_j and w_j and $h_{1,jk,\nu\mu}^{(i)}(x_j)$'s are the coefficients of $v_j^{\nu}\zeta_j^{\mu}$ in the expansion of

$$\sum_{(\nu,\mu)\geq(2,0)}\sum_{(p,q)\geq(0,1)} \begin{pmatrix} t_{jk}^{-\nu+1}s_{jk}^{-\mu}G_{kj,pq}^{(\nu,\mu)}(x_j) \\ t_{jk}^{-\nu}s_{jk}^{-\mu+1}Q_{kj,pq}^{(\nu,\mu)}(x_j) \end{pmatrix} \cdot \Big(v_j + \sum G_j^{(a,b)}v_j^a\zeta_j^b\Big)^p \cdot \Big(\zeta_j + \sum Q_j^{(a,b)}v_j^a\zeta_j^b\Big)^q \cdot v_j^{\nu}\zeta_j^{\mu}.$$

The second one is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}(8)\qquad \begin{pmatrix} t_{jk}w_k \\ s_{jk}z_k \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} w_j \\ z_j \end{pmatrix} + \sum_{(\nu,\mu)\geq(2,0)} \begin{pmatrix} g_{jk}^{(\nu,\mu)}(x_j) \\ q_{jk}^{(\nu,\mu)}(x_j) \end{pmatrix} \cdot w_j^\nu z_j^\mu \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} v_j \\ \zeta_j \end{pmatrix} + \sum_{(\nu,\mu)\geq(2,0)} \begin{pmatrix} G_j^{(\nu,\mu)}(x_j) + h_{2,jk,\nu\mu}^{(1)} \\ Q_j^{(\nu,\mu)}(x_j) + h_{2,jk,\nu\mu}^{(2)} \end{pmatrix} \cdot v_j^\nu \zeta_j^\mu .\end{aligned}$$

Here $h_{2,jk,\nu\mu}^{(i)}(x_j)$'s are the coefficients of $v_j^\nu \zeta_j^\mu$ in the expansion of

$$\sum_{(\nu,\mu)\geq(2,0)} \begin{pmatrix} g_{jk}^{(\nu,\mu)}(x_j) \\ q_{jk}^{(\nu,\mu)}(x_j) \end{pmatrix} \cdot \left(v_j + \sum G_j^{(a,b)} v_j^a \zeta_j^b\right)^\nu \cdot \left(\zeta_j + \sum Q_j^{(a,b)} v_j^a \zeta_j^b\right)^\mu .$$

By comparing two expansions (7) and (8), it is observed that one should take $\{G_j^{(\nu,\mu)}\}$ as a solution of the δ-equation

$$(9)\qquad \delta\{(U_j, G_j^{(\nu,\mu)})\} = \{(U_{jk}, h_{1,jk,\nu\mu}^{(1)} - h_{2,jk,\nu\mu}^{(1)})\} \in \check{Z}^1(\{U_j\}, N_{S/X}|_C^{-\nu+1} \otimes N_{C/S}^{-\mu})$$

and $\{Q_j^{(\nu,\mu)}\}$ as a solution of

$$(10)\qquad \delta\{(U_j, Q_j^{(\nu,\mu)})\} = \{(U_{jk}, h_{1,jk,\nu\mu}^{(2)} - h_{2,jk,\nu\mu}^{(2)})\} \in \check{Z}^1(\{U_j\}, N_{S/X}|_C^{-\nu} \otimes N_{C/S}^{-\mu+1}).$$

In fact, the following lemma tells that $\{G_j^{(\nu,\mu)}\}, \{Q_j^{(\nu,\mu)}\}$ are inductively determined by (9),(10) with some estimates to assure the existence of solutions of (6). Further, it is not difficult to check that, for $(n,m) \geq (2,0)$, $h_{1,jk,nm}^{(i)}(x_j), h_{2,jk,nm}^{(i)}(x_j)$ depend on the choice of $\{G_j^{(\nu,\mu)}\}, \{Q_j^{(\nu,\mu)}\}$ only for $\nu < n$ and $\mu \leq m$, or $\nu \leq n$ and $\mu < m$.

LEMMA 3.10. *There exists a power series* $A(X,Y) = \sum_{\nu=2}^{\infty}\sum_{\mu=0}^{\infty} A_{\nu,\mu} X^\nu Y^\mu$ *with positive radius of convergence which satisfy the following property for each* $(n,m) \geq (2,0)$*:*
if $\{G_j^{(\nu,\mu)}\}$ *and* $\{Q_j^{(\nu,\mu)}\}$ *satisfy* **(condition)**$_{(\nu,\mu)}$ *for each* $(2,0) \leq (\nu,\mu) < (n,m)$*, then there exist* $\{G_j^{(n,m)}\}$ *and* $\{Q_j^{(n,m)}\}$ *with* **(condition)**$_{(n,m)}$*.*

(condition)$_{(\nu,\mu)}$**:** $\{G_j^{(\nu,\mu)}\}$ *and* $\{Q_j^{(\nu,\mu)}\}$ *are solutions of the* δ*-equations (9) and (10) with* $\max_j \sup_{U_j} |G_j^{(\nu,\mu)}| \leq A_{\nu,\mu}$ *and* $\max_j \sup_{U_j} |Q_j^{(\nu,\mu)}| \leq A_{\nu,\mu}$ *respectively.*

Proof. Let $K_{k,\ell} := K(N_{S/X}|_C^{-k} \otimes N_{C/S}^{-\ell})$ be the constant as in [U, Lemma 3] (Kodaira-Spencer's lemma [KS]) and set $K := \max_{k,\ell} K_{k,\ell}$ (here we used the fact that $N_{S/X}|_C$ and $N_{C/S}$ are torsion). Take sufficiently large $M, R > 0$ such that $\sup_{W_{jk}} |t_{jk}w_k - w_j| < M$, $\sup_{W_{jk}} |s_{jk}z_k - z_j| < M$ and $\Delta_R = \{(x_j, z_j, w_j) \mid x_j \in U_{jk}, |z_j| < R^{-1}, |w_j| < R^{-1}\} \subset W_{jk}$ hold for each j,k (see Remark 3.11 (b) below). Consider the solution $A(X,Y)$ of the cubic

equation
(11)
$$A(X,Y) = KR\cdot\left(\frac{A(X,Y)(Y+A(X,Y))}{1-RY-RA(X,Y)} + \frac{A(X,Y)(X+A(X,Y))+MR(X+A(X,Y)^2)}{(1-RX-RA(X,Y))(1-RY-RA(X,Y))}\right).$$

Though the functional equation (11) has three solutions, the solution A is uniquely determined by the condition that $A(X,Y) = O(X^2)$.

In what follows, we check that this $A(X,Y)$ satisfies the required property. Assume the existence of $\{G_j^{(\nu,\mu)}\}, \{Q_j^{(\nu,\mu)}\}$ with **(condition)**$_{(\nu,\mu)}$ for each $(2,0) \le (\nu,\mu) < (n,m)$. Then the existence of solutions $\{G_j^{(n,m)}\}, \{Q_j^{(n,m)}\}$ of (9), (10) can be shown by the assumption (iii) of types, even if $(n,m) = (2,0)$. We omit this step here (see Remark 3.11 (c)). Next, let us estimate for such $\{G_j^{(n,m)}\}$ and $\{Q_j^{(n,m)}\}$. From the definition of $h^{(i)}_{1,jk,\nu\mu}(x_j)$ and the Cauchy's estimate for $G_k^{(\nu,\mu)}$ and $Q_k^{(\nu,\mu)}$ on $\Delta_{R,x_j} = \{|z_j| < R^{-1}, |w_j| < R^{-1}\}$, it follows that $|h^{(i)}_{1,jk,nm}(x_j)|$ is bounded by the coefficient of X^nY^m in the expansion of

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{(\nu,\mu)\ge(2,0)}\ \sum_{(p,q)\ge(0,1)} (A_{\nu,\mu}R^{p+q})\cdot(X+A(X,Y))^p\cdot(Y+A(X,Y))^q\cdot X^\nu Y^\mu\\
=&\sum_{(\nu,\mu)\ge(2,0)}\ \sum_{q=1}^{\infty}(A_{\nu,\mu}R^q)\cdot(Y+A(X,Y))^q\cdot X^\nu Y^\mu\\
+&\sum_{(\nu,\mu)\ge(2,0)}\ \sum_{(p,q)\ge(1,0)} (A_{\nu,\mu}R^{p+q})\cdot(X+A(X,Y))^p\cdot(Y+A(X,Y))^q\cdot X^\nu Y^\mu\\
=&\frac{RA(X,Y)(Y+A(X,Y))}{1-RY-RA(X,Y)} + \frac{RA(X,Y)(X+A(X,Y))}{(1-RX-RA(X,Y))(1-RY-RA(X,Y))}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, $|h^{(i)}_{2,jk,nm}(x_j)|$ is bounded by the coefficient of X^nY^m in the expansion of

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{(\nu,\mu)\ge(2,0)} MR^{\nu+\mu}\cdot(X+A(X,Y))^\nu\cdot(Y+A(X,Y))^\mu\\
=&\frac{MR^2(X+A(X,Y))^2}{(1-RX-RA(X,Y))(1-RY-RA(X,Y))}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, from [U, Lemma 3] and the functional equation (11), we can choose the solutions $\{G_j^{(n,m)}\}$ and $\{Q_j^{(n,m)}\}$ of the δ-equations (9) and (10) with $\max_j \sup_{U_j} |G_j^{(n,m)}| \le A_{n,m}$ and $\max_j \sup_{U_j} |Q_j^{(n,m)}| \le A_{n,m}$ respectively. □

Let $\{G_j^{(\nu,\mu)}\}$, $\{Q_j^{(\nu,\mu)}\}$ be the coefficients defined by Lemma 3.10. From the inverse function theorem, we obtain the solutions $\{v_j\}$ and $\{\zeta_j\}$ of the functional equation (6). Again by comparing two expansions of $(t_{jk}w_k, s_{jk}z_k)$ as (7) and (8) *without assuming* (5), it follows that these solutions satisfy the equation (5) (see Remark 3.11 (c)). The proof is completed. □

Remark 3.11. (a) Although the existence of an extension $\{z_j\}$ of $\{y_j\}$ of type $(2,0)$ is non-trivial, we can construct such an extension by solving a suitably determined Schröder

type functional equation

$$z'_j = z_j + \sum_{\mu=0}^{\infty} Q_j^{(1,\mu)}(x_j) \cdot w_j z_j^{\mu}$$

where $\{z'_j\}$ is an extension of type $(1,0)$. We can construct appropriate $\{Q_j^{(1,\mu)}\}$ from the condition $v_{1,m} = 0$ for each $m \geq 0$. Since the proof is almost the same as (and much easier than) the proof of Theorem 1.4, we skip the details (see also the proof of [K, Lemma 5 (i')]). Also remark that if $\mathrm{div}(f) = C$ and the 1-jet extension property holds, then an extension $\{z_j\}$ of $\{y_j\}$ of type $(2,0)$ obviously exists.

(b) Strictly speaking, one cannot take such R without shrinking W_k to a relatively compact subset. However, the same argument as in [U, p. 599] assures that it causes no problem to assume the existence of such R (see also [K, Remark 2]).

(c) We mention the outline of the proof for the existence of solutions $\{G_j^{(n,m)}\}, \{Q_j^{(n,m)}\}$ under fixing the solutions $\{G_j^{(\nu,\mu)}\}, \{Q_j^{(\nu,\mu)}\}$ of (9), (10) for $(2,0) \leq (\nu,\mu) < (n,m)$. Consider the solution of the functional equation

$$\begin{pmatrix} w_j \\ z_j \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} v_j \\ \zeta_j \end{pmatrix} + \sum_{(2,0)\leq(\nu,\mu)<(n,m)} \begin{pmatrix} G_j^{(\nu,\mu)}(x_j) \\ Q_j^{(\nu,\mu)}(x_j) \end{pmatrix} \cdot v_j^{\nu}\zeta_j^{\mu}.$$

From the δ-equations (9) and (10) for $(2,0) \leq (\nu,\mu) < (n,m)$, it follows from the inductive argument that the system $\{v_j\}$ is of type $(n-1,m)$ and the extension $\{\zeta_j\}$ is of type (n,m). By using this fact and comparing two expansions of $(t_{jk}w_k, s_{jk}z_k)$ as (7) and (8) without assuming (5), we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} t_{jk}v_k \\ s_{jk}\zeta_k \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} v_j \\ \zeta_j \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} h^{(1)}_{1,jk,nm} - h^{(1)}_{2,jk,nm} \\ h^{(2)}_{1,jk,nm} - h^{(2)}_{2,jk,nm} \end{pmatrix} \cdot v_j^n\zeta_j^m + O(\zeta_j^{m+1}) \cdot v_j^n + O(v_j^{n+1}).$$

From the assumption (iii), $u_{n-1,m}(C,S,X;\{v_j\}) = 0$ and $v_{n,m}(C,S,X;\{\zeta_j\}) = 0$ hold, so that we obtain the solutions $\{G_j^{(n,m)}\}, \{Q_j^{(n,m)}\}$ of (9), (10). For more details, see [K, Lemma 7].

Remark 3.12. Let us denote by $\mathcal{E}_1(C)$ the set of all elements $F \in \mathrm{Pic}^0(C)$ which satisfies the condition $|\log d(\mathbb{I}_C, F^n)| = O(\log n)$ as $n \to \infty$, where $\mathbb{I}_T \in \mathrm{Pic}^0(C)$ is the trivial line bundle and d is an invariant distance of $\mathrm{Pic}^0(C)$ ($\mathcal{E}_1(C)$ does not depend on the choice of d, see [U, §4.1]). Theorem 1.4 is also holds when $N_{S/X}|_C \cong N_{C/S}$ and $N_{S/X}|_C, N_{C/S} \in \mathcal{E}_1(C)$, which gives a corrected version of [K, Theorem (ii)].

4. Proof of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.3

4.1. **Proof of Theorem 1.3.** First we prove Theorem 1.3. The outline of the proof is based on that of [B, Theorem 1]. We use the result on the $U(1)$-flatness in Theorem 1.4 (we do not use the result on the existence of a transversal).

We will apply Theorem 1.4 instead of the original one [U, Theorem 3]. We lead to the contradiction by assuming that there exists a Levi-flat C^∞-embedding $(M,\mathcal{F}) \to X$. By shrinking X to an open neighborhood of C if necessary, we may assume that L is embedded in X. First we will check the conditions to apply Theorem 1.4.

LEMMA 4.1. *By shrinking X to an open neighborhood of C if necessary, the followings hold:*
(a) $N_{L/X}$ is holomorophically trivial,
(b) the pair (C, L, X) is of infinite type (in the sense of Definition 2.8), and
(c) f is of extension type infinity.

Proof. Since the holonomy of the foliation $\mathcal{F}$ is C^∞-flat along L, it follows that the normal bundle $N_{L/X}$ is holomorophically trivial and that there exists a system $\{w_j\}$ of type $n+1$ for each integer $n \geq 1$, see Proposition 2.10. Thus the obstruction class $u_{n,m}(C, L, X; \{w_j\})$ vanishes for each integer n, m. It follows from Lemma 3.5 and Proposition 3.8 that $u_{n,m}(C, L, X) = 0$ holds for *any* system of type (n, m). Hence, the triple (C, L, X) is of infinite type, see also Remark 2.9. The assertion (c) follows from Proposition 2.10, Lemma 3.7, and Proposition 3.8. □

From Lemma 4.1 and Theorem 1.4, we may assume that $\mathcal{O}_X(L)$ is $U(1)$-flat, in particular, holomorphically trivial. Thus, we can take a global holomorphic defining function $h\colon X \to \mathbb{C}$ of L. More precisely, we can take h as follows:

LEMMA 4.2. *By shrinking X to an open neighborhood of C if necessary, there exists a global holomorphic defining function $h\colon X \to \mathbb{C}$ of L such that $d(\operatorname{Re} h|_M)(x) \neq 0$ holds for each point $x \in L$.*

Proof. Let $\{(W_j, w_j)\}$ be the system of type $r = 2$ as in Proposition 2.10. In the last part of the proof of Theorem 1.4, we solved the functional equation

$$w_j = h + \sum_{\nu=2}^{\infty} \sum_{\mu=0}^{\infty} G_j^{(\nu,\mu)} \cdot h^\nu \zeta_j^\mu$$

to construct a global function h. From this equation, we obtain that

$$d(\operatorname{Re} h|_{W_j \cap M})(x) = d(\operatorname{Re} w_j|_{W_j \cap M})(x) \neq 0$$

holds for each $x \in L$. □

Take a function h as in Lemma 4.2. Fix a leaf $L' \in \mathcal{F}$ which accumulates on L and set $A := p^{-1}(E) \cap L'$, where $E \subset C$ is an elliptic curve as in Theorem 1.3. It follows from the holonomy condition that A is diffeomorphic to an annulus which is accumulating on E. From Lemma 4.2, $\operatorname{Re} h|_A$ is a *positive* harmonic function which tends to 0 on one of the boundaries. Let A be biholomorphic to the punctured disc. As compactfying A to the unit disk and extending h, we can apply the maximal principle to $-\operatorname{Re} h|_A$ to lead to the contradiction [B]. If A is biholomorphic to an annulus, by considering the Laurent expansion, we can conclude that $h|_A \equiv 0$ holds, which contradicts to Lemma 4.2. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.3. □

4.2. **Proof of Theorem 1.1.** When $\operatorname{div}(f) = C$, Theorem 1.1 directly follows from Theorem 1.3. In general case, it is easily observed that f defines an elliptic fibration containing C as a singular fiber. By replacing C with a general fiber, we can apply Theorem 1.3 to show the non-embeddability. □

5. Some examples

In this section, we give some examples. The following Example 5.4 shows Corollary 1.2.

Example 5.1. Let $(S^3, \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Reeb}}, J_{\mathcal{F}})$ be the Reeb foliation in Example 2.1 and Σ a Riemann surface (possibly non-compact). Consider a Levi-flat manifold $(S^3 \times \Sigma, \mathcal{G}, J_{\mathcal{G}})$ where $\mathcal{G} = \{L \times \Sigma \mid L \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Reeb}}\}$. The map $\widetilde{R}\backslash\{z = 0\} \ni (z, u) \mapsto z \in \mathbb{C}^*$ induces a retraction p as in the condition (ii) of Theorem 1.1. The other conditions also obviously hold. Therefore, this Levi-flat manifold does not admit a C^∞-embedding into any complex 3-manifolds. Note that this example is not covered by [B], [BI] and [D] if Σ is non-compact. The authors do not know if $(S^3, \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Reeb}}, J_{\mathcal{F}})$ admits a Levi-flat C^∞-embedding into a complex 3-manifold or higher dimensional one. The above example showed that there exist no such embeddings of $(S^3, \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Reeb}}, J_{\mathcal{F}}) \times \mathbb{C}$ (or $\mathbb{D}$) into complex 3-manifolds.

Remark 5.2. This also holds for turbulized Levi-flat manifolds instead of the Reeb foliation. The turbulization procedure for Levi-flat manifolds was introduced in [HM].

For our non-embeddability results, the assumption on the existence of a holomorphically embedded torus is essential. Actually, there exists a Levi-flat 5-manifold which is diffeomorphic to $(S^3, \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Reeb}}, J_{\mathcal{F}}) \times \mathbb{C}$ as C^r-foliated manifolds and which is embeddable in $\mathbb{C}^3$, see [FT, §9.1]. In this example, the torus is totally real and the holonomy is C^r-flat (not C^∞-flat).

Example 5.3. Let $(R, \mathcal{F}, J_{\mathcal{F}})$ be the 5-dimensional Reeb component described in Example 2.1. The boundary leaf L is a 2-dimensional Hopf manifold and it contains an elliptic curve

$$C = (\mathbb{C} \times \{0\} \times \{0\})\backslash\{(0', 0)\}/\langle\lambda\rangle^{\mathbb{Z}}.$$

Consider the map $f\colon L \to \mathbb{C}P^1$ induced by the map $\mathbb{C}^2\backslash\{0'\} \ni (z_1, z_2) \mapsto [z_1, z_2] \in \mathbb{C}P^1$. Then $(z_2/z_1) \circ f$ is a global holomorphic defining function of C on its neighborhood. It follows from Theorem 1.1 that the Reeb component $(R, \mathcal{F}, J_{\mathcal{F}})$ does not admit a Levi-flat C^∞-embedding into any complex 3-manifolds. Our result shows that a neighborhood of C can not be embeddable (cf. [D]).

Example 5.4. Let C be an elliptic curve and $L := C \times \mathbb{C}$ (or $C \times \mathbb{D}$). Take a representation $\rho : \pi_1(L) \to \mathrm{Diff}^\infty_+(\mathbb{R})$ (or $\mathrm{Diff}^\infty_+(S^1)$). Assume that $\rho(\alpha)$ has a C^∞-flat contracting fixed point at 0 and $\rho(\beta)$ is the identity for generators $\alpha, \beta \in \pi_1(L)$. After usual suspension procedure by ρ, we obtain a Levi-flat manifold $(M, \mathcal{F}, J_{\mathcal{F}})$ which is a foliated $\mathbb{R}$ (or S^1)-bundle. Obviously, this example satisfies the assumption in Theorem 1.1. Therefore, this is Levi-flat C^∞-nonembeddable into any complex 3-manifolds. On the other hand, in [BI, Example 1], Barrett and Inaba gave an example $(N', \mathcal{G}')$ which admits a Levi-flat C^∞-embedding into $\mathbb{C}^2$ (Precisely speaking, we need to slightly modify it so as to be an embedding). Hence we obtain a Levi-flat 5-manifold $(N, \mathcal{G}, J_{\mathcal{G}}) := (N', \mathcal{G}') \times \mathbb{C}^*$ which is Levi-flat C^∞-embeddable in $\mathbb{C}^3$. By choosing a suitable representation in the above construction, we can get a non-embeddable example $(M, \mathcal{F}, J_{\mathcal{F}})$ which is diffeomorphic to $(N, \mathcal{G}, J_{\mathcal{G}})$ as C^∞-foliated manifolds, so that the Corollary 1.2 follows.

Acknowledgment. The first author is supported by the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (KAKENHI No.25-2869).

References

[B] D. E. Barrett, Complex analytic realization of Reeb's foliation of S^3, Math. Z., **203** (1990), 355–361.

[BF] D. E. Barrett, J. -E. Fornæss, On the smoothness of Levi-foliations. Publ. Mat., **32** (1988), 171–177.

[BI] D. E. Barrett, T. Inaba, On the Topology of Compact Smooth Three-Dimensional Levi-Flat Hypersurfaces, J. Geom. Anal., **2** (1992), no. 6, 489–497.

[CC] A. Candel, L. Conlon, Foliations I and II, American Mathematical Society, 2003.

[CLPT] B. Claudon, F. Loray, J. V. Pereira, F. Touzet, Compact leaves of codimension one holomorphic foliations on projective manifolds, arXiv:math/1512.06623.

[D] G. Della Sala, Non-embeddability of certain classes of Levi flat manifolds, Osaka J. Math. **51** (2014), 161–169.

[FT] F. Forstnerič and C. Laurent-Thiébaut, Stein compacts in Levi-flat hypersurfaces, Trans. Amer. Math. Sor. **360** (2008), 307–329.

[HM] T. Horiuchi, Y. Mitsumatsu, Reeb components of leafwise complex foliations and their symmetries I, arXiv/1508.07162.

[KS] K. Kodaira and D. C. Spencer, A theorem of completeness o f characteristic systems of complete continuous systems, Amer. J. Math., **81** (1959), 477-500.

[K] T. Koike, Toward a higher codimensional Ueda theory, Math. Z., Volume 281, Issue 3 (2015), 967–991.

[N] A. Neeman, Ueda theory: theorems and problems., Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **81** (1989), no. 415.

[S] C. L. Siegel, Iterations of analytic functions, Ann. of Math., **43** (1942), 607–612.

[U] T. Ueda, On the neighborhood of a compact complex curve with topologically trivial normal bundle, J. Math. Kyoto Univ., **22** (1983), 583–607.

[1] Graduate School of, Mathematical Sciences, The University of Tokyo, 3-8-1 Komaba, Meguro-ku,, Tokyo, 153-8914, Japan

E-mail address: tkoike@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp

[2] Department of Mathematics, Tokai University, 4-1-1 Kitakaname, Hiratsuka-shi,, Kanagawa 259-1292, Japan

E-mail address: nogawa@tsc.u-tokai.ac.jp